

December 16, 2014
DPAS-II Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

Committee Members Present:

Kelley Brake – DASA
Bill Doolittle – PTA
Vicki Gehrt – Chiefs
Linda Hockman – DSEA
Char Hopkins – DASA
Rosaria Macera – DSEA
Lindsay O-Mara – Governor's Office
Ron Pierce – DSBA
Jennifer Smith – DSEA
TJ Vari – SASA
Jackie Wilson – Higher Ed

Committee Member Not Present:

David Sokola – Senate
Darryl Scott – House of Representatives (Needs Replacement)

Chair: TJ Vari
Co-chair: Rosaria Macera

Minutes indicate general themes, although additional discussion took place.

TJ: Made introductions. Agenda for the current meeting and minutes of last meeting were approved. Reviewed his thoughts on purpose of committee. Said Advisory seems to be more of a review group. Must review data and recommendations from other groups. Thinks it is a mistake for DOE to not have a seat at the table. Would like DOE to have a seat or two. Also thinks staffing of the committee should be explicit in Code. Also shared if having only 4 meetings will be enough to get it all done and make recommendations. May need to develop committees or meet 5 or 6 times. Would like to make the work more transparent and collaborative with the Department. Need to be clear about the Advisory Committee's purpose.

Ron: Need as many meetings needed to get the job done. His experience with state code/law is that you can't do less, but you can do more. There seems to be communication difficulties within the state. He is open to more meetings and subcommittees.

Bill: Important to have clear understanding of the committee's role so we don't duplicate activities. We need to coordinate with other groups.

TJ: At our meetings we will review ESEA waivers in March and proposed regulation changes in May. We also have an obligation to review data requested. When we make recommendations we need another work group to put that in place.

Bill: ESEA amendments may lead to the need for subcommittees

TJ: Made recommendations. Proposed having two seats from DOE added to the table. Also shared the need to agree upon a voting structure. Quorum? 2/3 of members present? (Conversation regarding voting methods occurred.) Shared that if DOE had two seats added to the table, the total number of committee members would be 17 (it would actually be 15). The quorum was set at 10 of 17 (actually 15) members, and a 2/3 majority vote when a quorum was present was agreed upon. (This may need to be revisited at the next meeting since the quorum was decided upon using the number 15 as the total number of current members – it is actually 13.) Shared the Department has agreed to record and post minutes. He reviewed the code related to open meetings and the “rules” of posting draft minutes and agendas.

Bill: Cautioned to be careful with email exchanges because they could be interpreted as “meetings.”

TJ: Shared he would like information shared with the committee by a staffed member of the Department – unofficially for now. Proposed recommendations:

- Committee to be officially staffed by DOE and to explicitly stated in Code
- 4 should be the MINIMUM number of meetings in Code – allowing for more
- Review of amendments and new waivers
- Committee makes recommendations for DPAS-II
- Committee should have two seats assigned to the Department – wants in Code
- Proposed changing the name of the committee to “Review”
- Work groups established based on recommendations made

Jackie: Are you saying existing Review Committee would no longer exist? Clarity and purpose is important.

TJ: Need stakeholder engagement groups to get into the weeds. Work groups need to get into the weeds and make recommendations and roll them up to the new “Review” committee. Current structure is not set up to do that.

Vicki: Believes the title of “Advisory” is important.

Jackie: Work groups are important to do the work. Let members of the work groups know their work will roll up to other members of stakeholders.

TJ: We are on our way to a clearer purpose. This was communicated by Laura at the last Review Committee Meeting. Would like Advisory language cleaned up.

Lindsay: Mentioned DE Code and how the language would need to be changed will need to be made with proposed recommendations.

TJ: Work groups are essential to continuous improvement. Committee was okay with leaving the name as “DPAS-II Advisory Committee”. Group voted and agreed upon the following recommendations:

- As official assigned person to staff the committee
- Option to have more than 4 meetings
- Department to have 2 seats at committee
- Clear up language in Code, specifically 1275(f), to reflect that the “Committee makes recommendations regarding educator quality...”

Public Comment: No one signed up, but K. Dwyer wanted to thank the committee for their work. She stands in support of the changes and clarifying roles that would outlast administrations. Thought that was a smart move.

TJ: Shared his thoughts regarding the improvement of DPAS-II. Wanted to discuss roll-up and category names, weighting of Components, vertical articulation of summative ratings, and binary nature of summative ratings.

Does not like the binary nature of the summative ratings as Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory. Prefers formative language of Distinguished, Proficient, Basic, or Unsatisfactory. Shared the committee does not need to get into the weeds with this but can recommend the structure be changed.

Teachers only need 2 out of 4 (in Components 1-4) to be considered Satisfactory. This is not a good structure. Would also like to consider the weighting of each of the components.

Also shared that there is a problem with Summatives and having off years. The electronic format easily allows for a Summative each year. If there was a more clear structure for ratings and more layers (Distinguished, Proficient, Basic and Unsatisfactory), this would solve the 99% problem. This would provide a more palatable data set to make determinations statewide for PD. The administer evaluation system is already set up similarly.

Jackie: Confirmed administrator system is. Principals want feedback and teachers do, too. Binary makes it confusing. Principal system makes it clear where you are. In true support of modifying to be similar.

Rosaria: According to code, weighting for Component V should be *“at least as high as any other component”*, but noted code does not specify 50%.

TJ: Genuine authentic feedback is important. Teachers don’t even know whether or not it is their summative year and are unclear where they land. Teachers need a clear understanding of where they are. He recommended the Department commission a workgroup to develop a roll-up system to work through next year. Our committee would review and advise.

Ron: Agrees the whole process needs to be simplified. Simpler, consistent, common sense. Agrees the weighting of Component 5 is too high. Teachers can’t control what goes on at home. Most teachers agree they should be held accountable, but it is too high. Added teachers and administrators are held accountable – but students are not. The feel-good, fuzzy education of the 80s and 90s is not going to cut it.

TJ: Evaluation should include student data but it’s a mathematical problem with it being over-weighted.

Rosaria: Recapped that recommendations include language should be clearer and more aligned, include professional development. Thinks work groups should start meetings and give ideas by May – not wait until next year. Systems in other states do annual evaluations with summatives and allows teachers with Distinguished ratings to delay summatives. Maybe that’s for the work groups to flush out.

TJ: We need to make the recommendations succinct to give to Secretary. Want language to be aligned and not binary at the Summative level.

Bill: The more differentiation, the better.

Jackie: Wants teachers to know, after hard work, they are Distinguished – not just Satisfactory.

TJ: Our recommendation needs to be a broad stroke and let the work group flush it out and bring ideas to us. Again, the recommendations are

- Aligned language, not binary
- Restructuring of the weighting
- Revisit summative structure
- Annual summatives

Jackie: Important to use data we collect to develop PD. Using rating levels better may allow us to do this.

Lindsay: Clarified the proposals regarding binary. Want consistent language and to revisit the “off-year”. Restructuring, reweighting, balancing is a bigger request. Find out what systems around the world/nation are doing rather than simply reweighting them. Shared information on the state’s current alternative system – TEF.

Jackie: Shared history of the development of the principal evaluation system. Didn’t redesign the whole system. We are the envy of other states because we have one system. We have a great way to track data. Cautioned the group from getting away from this.

PTO: Recommendation was it must be robust. More subcommittee work needed. Too much to do with a full group.

Rosaria: Wanted to be sure the problems and recommendations were outlined. (Much back and forth conversation led to the following:)

Committee identified concerns

- Component and summative rating system vocabulary is not consistent
- Current weighting and distribution of Components I through V could more appropriately differentiate teacher performance for the purposes of summative ratings and planning professional development.
- Component I through IV ratings are limited to a binary system (i.e satisfactory and unsatisfactory)
- Lack of annual and consistent feedback

The Committee asked for a work group to meet and:

- Align the language within the rating system
- Consider restructuring and rebalancing the weighting, including a more holistic approach to
- Evaluating educators and alternate ways to incorporate student achievement
- Expand a the binary rating system to include more ratings (Components I-IV)
- Revisit the summative structure and consider what we can do in the off year.

The above recommendations were voted on and agreed upon. Motion passed.

DOE and guest (JP Beaudoin) presented historical perspective of Measure Bs and Cs. Reviewed technical quality. Explained threats to validity and how they were avoided including teachers built the assessments (using specs and blueprints) with identified content standards, eliminated guessing, comprehensive refinements of the sets, increased rigors, alternative assessment review, and the current refinement cycle.

Vicki and Ron: See problems with item exposure on the part of teachers and students.

Vicki: Shared inequity with teachers measured with DCAS/Smarter vs. these assessments.

Linda: Group 1 teachers should be able to pick 2 Measure Bs since they are proven to be valid and reliable.

Vicki: It would be an eye opener to look at some random assessment items. How can we measure these teachers in different ways?

Atnre (DOE): There are layers to teachers' ratings. Not based on the assessments alone for Measure Bs and Cs. Goal setting determines the rating.

Shanna (DOE): Explained data information previously sent in Excel file. Added that there are some changes and the data was scrubbed once again. Led to improving numbers in almost all cases.

TJ: Brought up allowing for more Component 5 discretion. If administrators and teachers agree upon the assessment rather than selecting from choice the Department gives, this should be okay. Could this make it better or worse?

Atnre: The Department already allows choice. Can choose and external assessment, internal assessment, or you can build your own for approval.

Question and Answer:

JP answered questions and gave example of performance tasks.

For Next Meeting:

Request projector for meeting

Bring Measure Bs to meeting

Finalize recommendations for Measure Bs and Cs

Smarter Balanced

Recommendations for professional development

ESEA Waiver – can we get this before the next meeting for review?

May Meeting:

Proposed regulation changes